

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 6 and 11 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 and 16-21 are pending in this application.

Request for entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance without materially affecting the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In particular, the Office Action asserts that there is no recited step of generating an EDI document. In reply, the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method is directed to automatically extracting information from Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) documents or messages using an EDI system, to be used in analysis of the EDI documents. Accordingly, the EDI document is being received, extracted, and the extracted data is being used to analyze the EDI document. Thus, no EDI document generating step is needed in claim 1.

As to claim 6, the preamble of that claim recites a system for automatically generating data in a self-describing markup language format from an EDI document. Thus, the EDI

document is a document already existing in the system, and is not created by the system. The steps recited in claim are directed to generating data from the EDI document. Thus, no EDI document generating step is needed in claim 6.

As to claim 11, the preamble of that claim recites a “computer readable data storage medium for an EDI system having program code recorded thereon that is executable by a computer.” There is nothing in the preamble of claim 11 that is directed to generating an EDI document, and thus the preamble of claim 11 has not been amended.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,878,419 to Carter in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010700 to Wotring et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0111964 to Chen et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly recognizes that Carter does not explicitly disclose storing the extracted data elements in a hierarchical manner wherein the extracted data elements are linked in the memory with a common attribute. However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Wotring teaches those features. In particular, Wotring describes a system that transforms relational database information into a hierarchical data representation. However, Wotring does not teach or suggest storing extracted data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data. Rather, Wotring stores data in a hierarchical database based on a predetermined ordering of data, such as “Person” being a highest hierarchical order, “Date of Birth”, “SSN”, “Name”, “Physical Description” being a second highest hierarchical order, and “First Name”, “Middle Name”, and “Last Name” being a lowest hierarchical order.

This hierarchical ordering has nothing at all to do with whether an extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data. Thus, the combination of Carter and Wotring would, at best, teach a hierarchical storing of EDI data, but whereby that hierarchical storing would be based on predetermined relationships defined in the actual EDI document itself. For example, an EDI document of Carter that included information on a person,

such as what is shown in Figure 1 of Wotring, would be stored in a hierarchical manner based on those predetermined relationships, which have nothing to do with whether an extracted data is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Carter and Wotring.

Similar arguments hold for independent claims 6 and 11, whereby those claims are also patentable over the combination of Carter and Wotring.

With respect to the rejection of claim 16, the Office Action relies on Chen to allegedly teach the features recited in that claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Chen describes a system that presents a user with a hierarchical tree structure representation of a document to allow the user to select data groups rules to be followed. From those rules, a modified hierarchical tree structure is created. See Abstract of Chen.

Paragraph 0011 of Chen describes that a GUI tool is provided to allow a user to make different groupings for data. Column 0041 of Chen describes more features of the GUI tool, which allows a user to click on any leaf node to choose grouping options. Column 0045 of Chen describes a translator, which receives an EDI document and translates it into a translated DOM instance of XML document.

Nowhere do these cited portions of Chen teach or suggest a GUI that allows a user to select a particular document shell (e.g., a purchase order invoice shell) for which data retrieved is to be inputted, and to place the extracted data into the user-selected document shell. Rather, in Chen, the data is stored in a memory, and no creation of a different type of document (with the help of a GUI to allow the user to select a shell for that different type of document) is taught or suggested.

Accordingly, claim 16, as well as claims 18 and 20 which recite similar features, are patentable over the combination of Carter, Wotring and Chen, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

As to claims 17, 19 and 21, while Wotring describes a system that transforms relational database information into a hierarchical data representation, Wotring does not teach or suggest separately storing segments, transaction sets, or functional groups as respective segments in a

memory. Rather, Wotring does not make such a distinction among his data stored in a hierarchical manner according to predetermined relationships as set forth in the actual document itself.

Accordingly, claim 16, 18 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Carter, Wotring and Chen, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 4, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819